arXiv:1607.03233v2 [math.DG] 5 Oct 2016

The Prescribed Ricci Curvature Problem on Three-Dimensional Unimodular Lie Groups

Timothy Buttsworth

October 6, 2016

Abstract

Let G be a three-dimensional unimodular Lie group, and let T be a left-invariant symmetric $(0,2)$-tensor field on G. We provide the necessary and sufficient conditions on T for the existence of a pair (g,c) consisting of a left-invariant Riemannian metric g and a positive constant c such that $Ric(g) = cT$, where $Ric(g)$ is the Ricci curvature of g. We also discuss the uniqueness of such pairs and show that, in almost all cases, there exists at most one positive constant c such that $Ric(g) = cT$ is solvable for some left-invariant Riemannian metric g.

1 Introduction

A problem of fundamental interest in Riemannian geometry is finding a Riemannian metric g to satisfy the prescribed Ricci curvature equation

$$Ric(g) = T \tag{1.1}$$

for some fixed symmetric $(0,2)$-tensor field T on a manifold M. In [4], DeTurck shows that if T is non-degenerate at a point $p \in M$, then there is a Riemannian metric g such that equation (1.1) holds in some neighbourhood of p. DeTurck and Goldschmidt in [7] also show that (1.1) holds in a neighbourhood of a point if T has constant rank and satisfies certain other constraints. Further results on local existence are available in [1, 16, 18].

One would like to know when it is possible to find a Riemannian metric g such that equation (1.1) holds on all of M, and not merely on some neighbourhood. Many results on this problem rely on the inverse function theorem, for example, see [6, 3, 2, 20]. Older results on the global solvability of (1.1) are available in [1], and more recent progress can be found in, for example, [14, 15, 18, 17], but in general, finding results on the global solvability of (1.1) is proving to be challenging.

The work of Milnor in [13] contains results on the possible signatures the Ricci curvature of left-invariant Riemannian metrics can have on Lie groups. Subsequent to Milnor's results, a lot of work has been done investigating the Ricci curvature of left-invariant metrics. For example, in [9], Ha and Lee complete Milnor's classification of the available signatures of the Ricci curvature of left-invariant metrics on three-dimensional Lie groups, and in [12], Kremlev and Nikonorov also investigate the available signatures of the Ricci curvature, but on four dimensional Lie groups. In [11], Kowalski and Nikcevic find the possible eigenvalues of the Ricci curvature of left-invariant metrics on three-dimensional Lie groups. However, the Ricci curvature cannot be recovered from merely the signature or the eigenvalues so these results do not solve equation (1.1).

One result provided by DeTurck and Hamilton in [5] and [10], respectively, shows that if T is a positive-definite $(0,2)$-tensor field on the sphere $\mathbb{S}^2$, then (1.1) is solvable if and only if the volume of T, when viewed as a Riemannian metric, is 4π. This result indicates that, instead of finding a Riemannian metric g to solve (1.1), it may be reasonable to look for a Riemannian metric g and a positive constant c such that

$$Ric(g) = cT. \tag{1.2}$$

Indeed, in [10], Hamilton shows that if T is left-invariant and positive-definite on the Lie group $SO(3)$, then there is a unique $c > 0$ and a left-invariant Riemannian metric g, unique up to scaling,

such that (1.2) holds. Similarly, Pulemotov shows in [17] that if H is a maximal connected Lie subgroup of a compact Lie group G, then there is a solution of (1.2) for any invariant positive semi-definite T on the homogeneous space G/H. Furthermore, as shown in [17, 19], the pair (g, c) is unique up to the scaling of g when there are two inequivalent irreducible summands in the isotropy representation.

The results in [8, 5, 10, 17, 19] only apply to closed manifolds; there has been very little work on the global solvability of (1.2) on noncompact manifolds. In this paper, we resolve the question of global solvability of the prescribed Ricci curvature on three-dimensional unimodular Lie groups G where T and g are required to be left-invariant, thus extending the work of Hamilton in [10] to certain noncompact manifolds and arbritrary signatures of T. We also remark that our results imply the results about the available signatures of the Ricci cuvature of left-invariant metrics on three dimensional Lie groups in [13] and [9], but are inequivalent from the results of [11].

2 Summary of Results

If the Lie group G is three-dimensional and unimodular with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, Milnor shows in [13] that any left-invariant Riemannian metric g is diagonalisable in a basis $\{V_1, V_2, V_3\}$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ such that, if ϵ_{ijk} is the Levi-Civita symbol, the Lie bracket relations are

$$[V_i, V_j] = \sum_{k=1}^{3} \epsilon_{ijk} \lambda_k V_k \tag{2.1}$$

for some numbers λ_k. By scaling and reordering the basis elements, we can demand that $\lambda_k \in \{-2, 0, 2\}$, that there are more non-negative values of λ_k than negative values, that $\lambda_3 = 0$ if any zeroes appear and that $\lambda_1 = 2$, unless $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = 0$. The possibilities for $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$ with these extra constraints are then in one-to-one correspondence with the different three-dimensional unimodular Lie groups.

Our results are stated in Theorems 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 below. Together these theorems tell us that for a given left-invariant tensor T, there exists a pair (g, c), where g is a left-invariant Riemannian metric and $c > 0$, such that $Ric(g) = cT$, if and only if both of the following statements hold:

(i) T is diagonalisable in a basis V_1, V_2, V_3 which satisfies (2.1)

(ii) the diagonal components T_1, T_2, T_3 satisfy one of the constraints in Table 1 depending on the Lie group G we study.

For each possibility, the uniqueness of g and c in the pair. Note that if (g, c) is a solution, then $(c'g, c)$ is also a solution for any $c' > 0$ because of the scaling invariance of the Ricci curvature. Therefore, when we talk about the uniqueness of (g, c), we always mean uniqueness up to scaling of g. For example, when we write $g_1 \sim g_2$ in Table 1, we mean that g_1 is a scalar multiple of g_2. Also, for the rest of the paper, if we say our solution (g, c) is unique, then we mean that if we find another solution $(\bar{g}, \bar{c})$, then $\bar{c} = c$ and $\bar{g}$ is a scalar multiple of g. Similarly, if we say that there are multiple solutions for (g, c), we mean that there are solutions $(\bar{g}, \bar{c})$ for which $\bar{g}$ is not a multiple of g. If a signature of (T_1, T_2, T_3) is not listed in the table then either the Ricci curvature of any left-invariant metric does not attain that signature, or after a change of basis preserving (2.1), the signature is equivalent to another signature which is listed. One result that can be seen from Table 1 is the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1. *Let G be a 3-dimensional unimodular Lie group and let T be a left-invariant symmetric $(0, 2)$ tensor. Unless $T = 0$ or T has signature $(+, -, -)$ and $G = SO(3)$, there is at most one positive constant $c > 0$ such that there exists a left-invariant Riemannian metric g solving $Ric(g) = cT$.*

3 The Ricci Curvature of Invariant Metrics

To prove the results in Table 1 and Theorem 2.1 we must first compute the Ricci curvature of an arbitrary left-invariant metric g on the three-dimensional unimodular Lie group G. See [10]

Table 1:

Lie Group $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$	Signature of (T_1, T_2, T_3)	Necessary and sufficient conditions on (T_1, T_2, T_3)	Is c the same for all solutions?	$g_1 \sim g_2$ for any solutions (g_1, c) and (g_2, c)
$SO(3)$	$(+,+,+)$	-	Yes	Yes
$(2,2,2)$	$(+,0,0)$	-	Yes	No
	$(+,-,-)$	See Theorem 4.1	No	Yes
$SL(2)$	$(+,-,-)$	$T_3 + T_1 > 0$	Yes	Yes
$(2,2,-2)$	$(-,+,-)$	$T_3 + T_2 > 0$	Yes	Yes
	$(-,-,+)$	$\max\{-T_1, -T_2\} < T_3$	Yes	Yes
		$\min\{-T_1, -T_2\} > T_3$	Yes	Yes
		$T_3 = -T_1 = -T_2$	Yes	No
	$(-,0,0)$	-	Yes	No
	$(0,-,0)$	-	Yes	No
$E(2)$	$(0,0,0)$	-	No	No
$(2,2,0)$	$(+,-,-)$	$T_1 + T_2 > 0$	Yes	Yes
	$(-,+,-)$	$T_1 + T_2 > 0$	Yes	Yes
$E(1,1)$	$(0,0,-)$	-	Yes	No
$(2,-2,0)$	$(+,-,-)$	$T_1 + T_2 > 0$	Yes	Yes
	$(-,+,-)$	$T_1 + T_2 > 0$	Yes	Yes
H_3	$(+,-,-)$	-	Yes	Yes
$(2,0,0)$				
$\mathbb{R}^3$	$(0,0,0)$	-	No	No
$(0,0,0)$				

for closely related computations. For a given left-invariant metric g, choose a basis V_1, V_2, V_3 of $\mathfrak{g}$ such that (2.1) holds in which g is diagonal. Therefore, $g(V_i, V_j) = \delta^i_j v_i$ for some positive numbers v_1, v_2, v_3, where δ^i_j is the Kronecker symbol. We then compute the Ricci curvature and find

$$Ric(V_1, V_1) = \frac{2x_2x_3}{v_2v_3}, \qquad Ric(V_2, V_2) = \frac{2x_1x_3}{v_1v_3}, \qquad Ric(V_3, V_3) = \frac{2x_1x_2}{v_1v_2}$$

where

$$x_1 = \frac{\lambda_2 v_2 + \lambda_3 v_3 - \lambda_1 v_1}{2}, x_2 = \frac{\lambda_1 v_1 + \lambda_3 v_3 - \lambda_2 v_2}{2}, x_3 = \frac{\lambda_1 v_1 + \lambda_2 v_2 - \lambda_3 v_3}{2};$$

and $R(V_i, V_j) = 0$ whenever $i \neq j$, cf. [10, section 6]. Therefore, the Ricci curvature of g in a basis where g is diagonal is also diagonal.

This tells us immediately that for $Ric(g) = cT$ to hold, since g is diagonalisable, g and T must be simultaneously diagonalisable in a basis V_1, V_2, V_3 which satisfies (2.1). In the search for a left-invariant metric g and positive constant c to solve the equation $Ric(g) = cT$, it therefore suffices to look for metrics on $\mathfrak{g}$ which are diagonal in some basis V_1, V_2, V_3 satisfying (2.1) in which T is also diagonal, say

$$T(V_i, V_j) = \delta^i_j T_i. \tag{3.1}$$

Once such a basis V_1, V_2, V_3 is found, solving $Ric(g) = cT$ for g diagonal in the basis V_1, V_2, V_3 is equivalent to solving the system of equations

$$\frac{2x_jx_k}{v_jv_k} = cT_i \tag{3.2}$$

for $i = 1, 2, 3$ where for a given i, the indices $j, k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ are chosen such that i, j, k are pairwise distinct. Also note that v_i are required to be positive. Due to the scaling invariance of the Ricci curvature, if we have a solution (v_1, v_2, v_3, c) of this system of equations, then we can scale (v_1, v_2, v_3) so that the additional constraint $v_1v_2v_3c = 1$ is satisfied. If this constraint is satisfied, then (3.2) becomes

$$2v_ix_jx_k = T_i, \tag{3.3}$$

so we can study this system of equations as an alternative of (3.2). Note that if we find a solution v_1, v_2, v_3 of (3.3), we can recover the associated c from the formula $v_1v_2v_3c = 1$, finding a solution of (3.2); cf. [10, section 6].

This reasoning is summarised in the following.

Lemma 3.1. *Let T be a left-invariant $(0,2)$ tensor field on a three-dimensional unimodular Lie group G. There exists a left-invariant Riemannian metric g and a constant $c > 0$ such that $Ric(g) = cT$ if and only if the following conditions hold:*

(i) there exists a basis V_1, V_2, V_3 of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ satisfying (2.1) in which T is diagonal

(ii) there is a solution (v_1, v_2, v_3, c) of (3.2), or equivalently, a solution (v_1, v_2, v_3) of (3.3) with T_i given by (3.1).

In the following sections, we will analyse the solvability of (3.2), or equivalently, (3.3), on the different three-dimensional unimodular Lie groups for T_i given in (3.1). Note that when discussing solutions of (3.2), we will use the same uniqueness convention as we do for solutions of $Ric(g) = cT$. Namely, we will only discuss uniqueness of solutions of (3.2) up to scaling of the triplet (v_1, v_2, v_3).

Once we have found solutions of (1.2), we will verify the conditions of the following lemma to study the uniqueness of solutions.

Lemma 3.2. *Let T be a non-zero left-invariant $(0,2)$ tensor field on G and let g be a left-invariant metric such that $Ric(g) = cT$ for some $c > 0$. Then (g, c) is the unique pair such that $Ric(g) = cT$ if both of the following conditions hold:*

(i) g is diagonal in any basis X_1, X_2, X_3 in which T is diagonal and (2.1) is satisfied

(ii) the solution v_1, v_2, v_3 of (3.3) is unique whenever T_1, T_2, T_3 are the components of T in a X_1, X_2, X_3 basis satisfying (2.1).

Furthermore, (ii) is a necessary condition for (g, c) to be the unique pair solving $Ric(g) = cT$.

Proof. Suppose that these two conditions were true and suppose that we had another left-invariant metric $\overline{g}$ such that $Ric(\overline{g}) = \overline{c}T$ for some positive constant $\overline{c}$. Let X_1, X_2, X_3 be a basis in which $\overline{g}$ is diagonal, T is diagonal and (2.1) holds. We know that g is also diagonal in this basis by condition (i).

If we let v_1, v_2, v_3 be the components of g and $\overline{v_1}, \overline{v_2}, \overline{v_3}$ be the components of $\overline{g}$ in the X_1, X_2, X_3 basis, then (v_1, v_2, v_3, c) and $(\overline{v_1}, \overline{v_2}, \overline{v_3}, \overline{c})$ are both solutions of (3.2) with $T_i = T(X_i, X_i)$. After possibly scaling both g and $\overline{g}$ we can assume that $v_1v_2v_3c = 1$ and $\overline{v_1v_2v_3c} = 1$. This ensures that v_1, v_2, v_3 and $\overline{v_1}, \overline{v_2}, \overline{v_3}$ are both solutions of (3.3). The solution of (3.3) is unique by condition (ii), which means that g is the same as $\overline{g}$ up to scaling. We also see that $cT = Ric(g) = Ric(\overline{g}) = \overline{c}T$ so $c = \overline{c}$ as well.

It is clear that if (ii) does not hold, we get multiple solutions (g, c) of $Ric(g) = cT$. □

Remark 3.3. If $G = SO(3)$ and T has signature $(+,-,-)$, we find from Lemma 4.4 that (3.3) has at most two solutions. Lemma 3.2 can be generalised in the obvious way to show that, in this case, there are at most two solutions of $Ric(g) = cT$.

4 The Special Orthogonal Group $SO(3)$

We have $\lambda_k = 2$ for $k = 1, 2, 3$. Theorem 4.1 below is our main result of this section. Note that if T is diagonal in a basis satisfying (2.1), it is also diagonal in a basis V_1, V_2, V_3 satisfying (2.1) such that $T(V_1, V_1) \geq T(V_2, V_2) \geq T(V_3, V_3)$ because $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3$. This follows by reordering and rescaling the basis vectors. Therefore, for Theorem 4.1 and its proof, we assume without loss of generality that the diagonal entries of T are ordered in this way.

Theorem 4.1. *Let T be a left-invariant $(0,2)$ tensor field on $SO(3)$. There exists a left-invariant Riemannian metric g and a positive constant $c > 0$ such that $Ric(g) = cT$ if and only if T is diagonalisable with $T = diag(T_1, T_2, T_3)$ in a basis V_1, V_2, V_3 satisfying (2.1) with $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = 2$ and one of the following conditions is satisfied:*

(i) $T_1 \geq T_2 \geq T_3 > 0$

(ii) $T_1 > 0$, $T_2 = T_3 = 0$

(iii) $T_1 > 0$, $T_3 \leq T_2 < 0$ *and either* $\bar{f}(-\frac{T_1+T_2+T_3}{3}) \geq 0$ *while* $-\frac{T_1+T_2+T_3}{3} < 0$, *or else* $\bar{f}(-T_1) > 0$ *where*

$$\bar{f}(p) = 2p^3 + (T_1 + T_2 + T_3)p^2 - T_1T_2T_3.$$

In case (i), the solution (g, c) *is unique. In case (ii), there are infinitely many solutions* (g, c), *but* c *is the same for all solutions. In case (iii), the solution* (g, c) *is unique unless* $\bar{f}(-T_1) < 0$, $-\frac{T_1+T_2+T_3}{3} < 0$ *and* $\bar{f}(-\frac{T_1+T_2+T_3}{3}) > 0$, *in which case there are two solutions* (g_1, c_1) *and* (g_2, c_2) *with* $c_1 \neq c_2$.

All that follows in this section is the proof of Theorem 4.1. To examine the existence component of Theorem 4.1, in accordance with Lemma 3.1, first we fix a basis V_1, V_2, V_3 in which T is diagonal and look for solutions of (3.2) or (3.3). Once we have analysed the solvability of (3.2) or (3.3), we will then investigate uniqueness by examining new bases X_1, X_2, X_3 which satisfy the same constraints as V_1, V_2, V_3, and use Lemma 3.2.

On $SO(3)$, the system of equations (3.3) becomes

$$(x_2 + x_3)x_2x_3 = T_1, \qquad (x_1 + x_3)x_1x_3 = T_2, \qquad (x_1 + x_2)x_1x_2 = T_3.$$

The case where T is positive-definite, so $T_1, T_2, T_3 > 0$, was treated by Hamilton in [10] and is presented as Lemma 4.2.

Lemma 4.2. *If* $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = 2$ *and* $T_1, T_2, T_3 > 0$, (3.3) *has a unique solution* (v_1, v_2, v_3) *such that* $v_1, v_2, v_3 > 0$.

With Lemma 4.2 and the equation $v_1v_2v_3c = 1$, we can then recover a solution (v_1, v_2, v_3, c) of (3.2) which is unique up to the scaling of (v_1, v_2, v_3).

The proof of Lemma 4.2 uses a correspondence between solutions of (3.3) and solutions of the equation

$$f(p) = \frac{p}{p + T_1} + \frac{p}{p + T_2} + \frac{p}{p + T_3} = 1. \tag{4.1}$$

To see this correspondence, let p be a solution of (4.1) and then define q by $q^3 = p(p + T_1)(p + T_2)(p + T_3)$. Then

$$x_1 = \frac{q}{p + T_1}, \qquad x_2 = \frac{q}{p + T_2}, \qquad x_3 = \frac{q}{p + T_3} \tag{4.2}$$

is a solution of (3.3).

Conversely, if x_1, x_2, x_3 is a solution of (3.3), then let $p = x_1x_2x_3$ and $q = p(x_1 + x_2 + x_3)$. There are then two possibilities: either $x_1x_2x_3(x_1 + x_2 + x_3) = 0$ or

$$x_1 = \frac{x_1x_2x_3(x_1 + x_2 + x_3)}{x_2x_3(x_1 + x_2 + x_3)} = \frac{q}{p + T_1}, \qquad x_2 = \frac{q}{p + T_2}, \qquad x_3 = \frac{q}{p + T_3},$$

and p satisfies (4.1).

Now we will examine other possibilities for the signature of T. From (3.2) we can see that the only other possibilities for the signs of T_1, T_2, T_3, given our ordering conventions, are $T_1 > 0$ and $T_3 \leq T_2 < 0$, or $T_1 > 0$ and $T_2 = T_3 = 0$. In the case that $T_1 < 0$ and $T_2 = T_3 = 0$, we will not look at (3.3), but the original system (3.2).

Lemma 4.3. *If* $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = 2$, $T_1 > 0$ *and* $T_2 = T_3 = 0$, *then the system of equations* (3.2) *has a solution* (v_1, v_2, v_3, c) *such that* $v_1, v_2, v_3 > 0$. *There are infinitely many solutions, but* $c = \frac{8}{T_1}$ *for all solutions.*

Proof. The proof is straightforward. □

In the second case that $T_1 > 0$ and $T_3 \leq T_2 < 0$, we know from (3.2) that none of x_1, x_2 or x_3 can be 0 and $x_1 + x_2 + x_3 = v_1 + v_2 + v_3 > 0$. Therefore, solutions of (3.3) are in correspondence with solutions of (4.1) so we will look for solutions of (4.1) as Hamilton did in Lemma 4.2.

Lemma 4.4. *If $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = 2$, $T_1 > 0$ and $T_2, T_3 < 0$, let $\bar{f} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined as*

$$\bar{f}(p) = 2p^3 + (T_1 + T_2 + T_3)p^2 - T_1T_2T_3. \tag{4.3}$$

Then (3.3) has a solution for (x_1, x_2, x_3) such that $v_1, v_2, v_3 > 0$ if and only if
(i) $\bar{f}(-\frac{T_1+T_2+T_3}{3}) \geq 0$ while $-\frac{T_1+T_2+T_3}{3} < 0$, or
(ii) $\bar{f}(-T_1) > 0$.
The solution is unique unless $\bar{f}(-T_1) < 0$, $-\frac{T_1+T_2+T_3}{3} < 0$ and $\bar{f}(-\frac{T_1+T_2+T_3}{3}) > 0$, in which case there are two solutions.

Remark 4.5. It is easily verified that both conditions (i) and (ii) are achieved by some T. Also, if, for instance, $T_1 = 10$ and $T_2 = T_3 = -1$, then $\bar{f}$ satisfies the conditions to have two solutions, so non-uniqueness is attainable.

Proof. For this proof, we will find a solution p of (4.1). However, first we need to find under what circumstances the solution will result in v_1, v_2, v_3 all being positive.

From (3.3), we see that we need x_2 and x_3 to have the same sign, and x_1 to have the opposite sign in order to have v_1, v_2, v_3 all of the same sign. If this is the case, the sign of v_1, v_2, v_3 is positive if and only if x_2, x_3 are positive because $x_2 + x_3 = 2v_1$.

Once we find a solution of (4.1), the numbers x_1, x_2, x_3 solving (3.3) are given by (4.2) where $q^3 = p(p + T_1)(p + T_2)(p + T_3)$. Therefore, the solution of (3.3) has x_2 and x_3 positive and x_1 negative if and only if the corresponding solution p of (4.1) satisfies $-T_1 < p < 0 < -T_2 \leq -T_3$.

Solving (4.1) on the interval $(-T_1, 0)$ is equivalent to solving the equation

$$\bar{f}(p) = 2p^3 + (T_1 + T_2 + T_3)p^2 - T_1T_2T_3 = 0 \tag{4.4}$$

on the interval $(-T_1, 0)$. Since this is a cubic polynomial, $\bar{f}$ has at most two critical points and will be monotone on any interval not containing a critical point. Therefore, to evaluate how many solutions p of (4.4) exist in the interval $(-T_1, 0)$, it suffices to check the value of $\bar{f}(p)$ at $-T_1$, 0 and the critical points. After straightforward computation, we conclude that a solution exists if and only if (i) or (ii) holds, and that the solution is unique unless $\bar{f}(-T_1) < 0$, $-\frac{T_1+T_2+T_3}{3} < 0$ and $\bar{f}(-\frac{T_1+T_2+T_3}{3}) > 0$.

□

Once we have a (v_1, v_2, v_3) solution of (3.3) with Lemma 4.4, this triplet alongside the positive constant c found with $v_1v_2v_3c = 1$ is then a solution of (3.2). This solution of (3.2) is unique up to the scaling of v_1, v_2, v_3.

We have established that in some instances, there are two solutions of (3.3). This means that we have two different solutions (v_1, v_2, v_3, c) of (3.2). We claim that the two values for c in these two solutions are different. Indeed, if we have a solution of (3.3) then we have a solution of (3.2) such that $v_1v_2v_3c = 1$. If we multiply each of the equations in (3.2) by $\frac{x_i}{v_i}$, since $x_1x_2x_3 = p$ and $v_1v_2v_3c = 1$, we find that for each i, $\frac{x_i}{v_i} = \frac{2p}{T_i}$. Putting these relations back into any one of the three equations of (3.2) reveals that $8p^2 = cT_1T_2T_3$ so c must be chosen accordingly. Since the two different solutions came about because there were two different negative values of p, we must get two different associated values for c.

We have now concluded the existence component of Theorem 4.1. To address the issue of uniqueness we will check the hypothesis of Lemma 3.2. To do this we need to consider the non-uniqueness of bases which satisfy (2.1) in which T is diagonal and $T_1 \geq T_2 \geq T_3$ is satisfied.

Lemma 4.6. *Let V_1, V_2, V_3 be a basis which satisfies (2.1) in which T is diagonal with $T_1 \geq T_2 \geq T_3$. If X_1, X_2, X_3 is another basis in which the same properties hold, then $X_i = \sum_{j=1}^{3} a_{ji}V_j$ for some $SO(3)$ matrix $(a_{ij})_{i,j=1}^{3}$ such that $a_{ij} = 0$ whenever $T_i \neq T_j$. We also have $T(X_i, X_i) = T(V_i, V_i) = T_i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$.*

Proof. Since the change preserves the Lie bracket relations (2.1), the matrix $a = (a_{ij})_{i,j=1}^{3}$ must be an $SO(3)$ matrix. There are various arguments available to show this. One way is by creating a cross product on the Lie algebra which is the same as the Lie bracket. We can then use the orthogonality properties of the cross product to obtain the result.

It is then straightforward to show that for T to remain diagonal, we must have $a_{ij} = 0$ whenever $T_i \neq T_j$, and the representation of T is the same in the basis X_1, X_2, X_3. □

We are now in a position to prove the uniqueness part of Theorem 4.1. Suppose we have a tensor field T which is diagonal in a V_1, V_2, V_3 basis with entries T_1, T_2, T_3. We need to check that the hypotheses of Lemma 3.2 hold, so we need to establish whether or not the metrics g of our solutions (g, c) are diagonal in other bases in which T is diagonal and (2.1) is satisfied.

If all three of T_1, T_2, T_3 are different, Lemma 4.6 implies that the only changes of basis which preserve the relations (2.1) are scalings of the V_1, V_2, V_3 basis so any diagonal metric in the V_1, V_2, V_3 basis is trivially diagonal in the new basis. Therefore, Lemma 3.2, coupled with Remark 3.3, implies that the uniqueness of solutions is completely determined by the uniqueness of solutions of (3.3).

Let us now suppose that exactly two of the entries are the same, say $T_i = T_j$ and let k be the remaining index. In this instance, Lemma 4.6 tells us that our change of basis is an $SO(3)$ matrix such that $a_{ik} = a_{jk} = a_{ki} = a_{kj} = 0$, so the representation of T is the same.

Now since $T_i = T_j$, any solution (v_1, v_2, v_3) of (3.3) must satisfy $v_i = v_j$ or $x_k = v_i + v_j - v_k = 0$. In the case that $x_k = v_i + v_j - v_k = 0$ we find that two of T_1, T_2, T_3 are 0. By our ordering convention this means that we are in the situation where $x_1 = 0$, $T_1 > 0$ and $T_2 = T_3 = 0$. The solutions of $Ric(g) = cT$ are non-unique because the solutions of (3.2) are non-unique. However, we note that $T(X_1, X_1) = T_1$ for any change of basis which preserves (2.1) in which T remains diagonal. Since the solution of (3.2) satisfies $c = \frac{8}{T_1}$, the value of c is the same for all solutions.

In the case that $v_i = v_j$ and none of T_1, T_2, T_3 is 0, computation reveals that the change of basis leaves the metric diagonal. Therefore, Lemma 3.2 tells us that the pair (g, c) solving $Ric(g) = cT$ is unique, or, by Remark 3.3, there are two solutions if T has signature $(+, -, -)$ and T satisfies the conditions of Lemma 4.4 for two solutions.

If $T_1 = T_2 = T_3$ then all three of T_1, T_2, T_3 must be positive to have a solution of (3.3). In this case, similarly to the case that two of T_1, T_2, T_3 are the same, we find that $\frac{x_1}{v_1} = \frac{x_2}{v_2} = \frac{x_3}{v_3}$ and since none of x_1, x_2, x_3 can be 0, our solution of (3.3) must also satisfy $v_1 = v_2 = v_3$. Therefore any change of basis that leaves T diagonal will also leave the metric solution of $Ric(g) = cT$ diagonal and Lemma 3.2 can be applied.

This treats the issue of uniqueness and concludes our analysis on $SO(3)$.

5 The Special Linear Group $SL(2)$

For $SL(2)$, we have $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 2$ and $\lambda_3 = -2$. The main result of this section is presented in the following theorem.

Theorem 5.1. *Let T be a left-invariant $(0, 2)$ tensor on $SL(2)$. There exists a left-invariant Riemannian metric g and a positive constant $c > 0$ such that $Ric(g) = cT$ if and only if T is diagonalisable with $T = diag(T_1, T_2, T_3)$ in a basis satisfying (2.1) with $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 2$, $\lambda_3 = -2$ and one of the following conditions is satisfied:*

(i) $T_1 > 0$, $T_2, T_3 < 0$, $-T_1 < T_3$
(ii) $T_2 > 0$, $T_1, T_3 < 0$, $-T_2 < T_3$
(iii) $T_1, T_2 < 0$, $T_3 > 0$, $\max\{-T_1, -T_2\} < T_3$
(iv) $T_1, T_2 < 0$, $T_3 > 0$, $\min\{-T_1, -T_2\} > T_3$
(v) $T_1 = T_2 = -T_3 < 0$
(vi) $T_1 < 0$, $T_2 = T_3 = 0$
(vii) $T_2 < 0$, $T_1 = T_3 = 0$.

In the cases (i)-(iv), the solution (g, c) of $Ric(g) = cT$ is unique. In (v)-(vii), there are infinitely many solutions (g, c), but c is the same for all solutions.

What follows in this section is the proof of Theorem 5.1. To prove the existence component of this theorem, we will use Lemma 3.1, so we fix a basis V_1, V_2, V_3 in which T is diagonal and (2.1) is satisfied. Once such a basis is found, we look for solutions of (3.2) or (3.3). To examine the uniqueness component of Theorem 5.1, we will then consider other bases X_1, X_2, X_3 which satisfy (2.1) in which T is also diagonal in order to examine the uniqueness component of Theorem 5.1 in accordance with Lemma 3.2.

Similarly to what we found for $SO(3)$, solutions of this system are in one-to-one correspondence with solutions of

$$f(p) = \frac{p}{p + T_1} + \frac{p}{p + T_2} + \frac{p}{p - T_3} = 1. \tag{5.1}$$

The correspondence is described with

$$x_1 = \frac{q}{p+T_1}, \qquad x_2 = \frac{q}{p+T_2}, \qquad x_3 = \frac{q}{p-T_3} \tag{5.2}$$

where q is given by $q^3 = p(p+T_1)(p+T_2)(p-T_3)$.

Now to prove the existence component of Theorem 5.1, we need to solve equation (3.2) or equation (3.3). We will treat these by the signs of T_1, T_2, T_3. Also note that when solving (3.3), we will use the equivalence between (3.3) and (5.1) that we just discussed.

We can see from (3.2) that two of T_1, T_2, T_3 are negative and the third is positive, or two of T_1, T_2, T_3 are 0 and the third, which cannot be T_3, is negative. If two of T_1, T_2, T_3 are negative and the third is positive, we know that we cannot have any of x_1, x_2, x_3 being 0. Furthermore, if $x_1 + x_2 + x_3 = 0$, then $v_3 = v_1 + v_2$ and (3.2) implies that $T_1 = T_2 = -T_3$. Therefore, in all cases except where $T_1 = T_2 = -T_3 < 0$, $x_1x_2x_3(x_1 + x_2 + x_3) \neq 0$ so solving (5.1) is equivalent to solving (3.3).

Lemma 5.2. *If $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 2$, $\lambda_3 = -2$, $T_1 > 0$ and $T_2, T_3 < 0$, then (3.3) has a solution such that $v_1, v_2, v_3 > 0$ if and only if $-T_1 < T_3$. If $T_2 > 0$ and $T_1, T_3 < 0$, then (3.3) has a solution with $v_1, v_2, v_3 > 0$ if and only if $-T_2 < T_3$. The solution is unique in both cases.*

Proof. We construct a solution of (3.3) by finding a solution of (5.1) and checking that v_1, v_2, v_3 associated to this solution are all positive.

First let us suppose that $T_1 > 0$ and $T_2, T_3 < 0$. In this case we note that $f(p) > 1$ if $p < \min\{-T_1, T_3, -T_2\}$, $f(p) < 1$ if $\max\{-T_1, T_3\} < p < 0$, and $f(p) > 1$ if $p > -T_2$. Thus the only possible solutions of (5.1) are p between T_3 and $-T_1$, or between 0 and $-T_2$. From (5.2) and (3.2), we see that the solution needs to be between T_3 and $-T_1$ to have v_1, v_2, v_3 all positive, and we also require $-T_1 < T_3$. If indeed we do have $-T_1 < T_3$, then as p approaches $-T_1$ from above, $f(p)$ approaches $-\infty$, and as p approaches T_3 from below, $f(p)$ approaches $+\infty$, so we have a solution of (5.1).

We claim that this solution is unique. To see this, similarly to what we did for $SO(3)$, convert $f(p) = 1$ into the cubic equation

$$\bar{f}(p) = 2p^3 + (T_1 + T_2 - T_3)p^2 + T_1T_2T_3 = 0. \tag{5.3}$$

It is straightforward to show that the solution $p \in (-T_1, T_3)$ is unique by analysing the behaviour of the critical points of $\bar{f}$.

If $T_2 > 0$ and $T_1, T_3 < 0$, similar reasoning reveals that for positive v_1, v_2, v_3, we require $-T_2 < T_3$, and that there is indeed a unique solution of (5.1) between $-T_2$ and T_3. □

Let us now consider the case where $T_1, T_2 < 0$ and $T_3 > 0$.

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 2$, $\lambda_3 = -2$, $T_1, T_2 < 0$, $T_3 > 0$ and the two equations $T_3 = -T_1$ and $T_3 = -T_2$ do not hold simultaneously. Then (3.3) has a solution satisfying $v_1, v_2, v_3 > 0$ if and only if $\max\{-T_1, -T_2\} < T_3$ or $T_3 < \min\{-T_1, -T_2\}$. This solution is unique.*

Proof. From (3.2) and (5.2) we see that our solution p of (5.1) corresponds to v_1, v_2, v_3 all being positive if and only if $\max\{-T_1, -T_2\} < p < T_3$ or $T_3 < p < \min\{-T_1, -T_2\}$. If $\max\{-T_1, -T_2\} < T_3$ then we have a unique solution because $f(p)$ is monotonically decreasing on the interval $(\max\{-T_1, -T_2\}, T_3)$, with $f(p)$ approaching ∞ and $-\infty$ as p approaches $\max\{-T_1, -T_2\}$ and T_3, respectively. Similarly, if $T_3 < \min\{-T_1, -T_2\}$ a solution exists and is unique. □

Lemma 5.4. *Suppose $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 2$, $\lambda_3 = -2$, $T_1, T_2 < 0$, $T_3 > 0$ and $T_1 = -T_3$ or $T_2 = -T_3$. Then the system of equations (3.2) has a solution (v_1, v_2, v_3, c) where $v_1, v_2, v_3 > 0$ if and only if $T_1 = T_2 = -T_3$. There are infinitely many solutions (v_1, v_2, v_3, c), but c is the same for all solutions.*

Proof. If exactly one of the two equations $T_3 = -T_1$ or $T_3 = -T_2$ holds then Lemma 5.3 implies that there is no solution of (3.3), hence there is no solution of (3.2). We can therefore assume that $T_1 = T_2 = -T_3 < 0$. In this case, (3.2) implies that $v_1 + v_2 = v_3$, and $c = \frac{8}{T_3}$, which are sufficient constraints for a solution. □

Now we will consider the cases where at least one of T_1, T_2, T_3 is 0.

Lemma 5.5. *Suppose $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 2$, $\lambda_3 = -2$ and at least one of T_1, T_2, T_3 is 0. Then the system of equations (3.2) has a solution (v_1, v_2, v_3, c) such that $v_1, v_2, v_3 > 0$ if and only if $T_1 < 0$ and $T_2 = T_3 = 0$, or $T_2 < 0$ and $T_1 = T_3 = 0$. There are infinitely many solutions (v_1, v_2, v_3, c), but c is the same for all solutions and is given by $c = -\frac{T_i}{8}$ where i is the unique index such that $T_i < 0$.*

Proof. The proof is straightforward. □

We have now shown exactly when equations (3.2) and (3.3) have solutions for positive v_1, v_2, v_3. By Lemma 3.1, this settles the existence component of Theorem 5.1. Now to examine uniqueness, we must consider all bases X_1, X_2, X_3 which satisfy (2.1) for $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = -\lambda_3 = 2$ in which T remains diagonal. To use Lemma 3.2 we need to show that the g solution of $Ric(g) = cT$ which is diagonal in the V_1, V_2, V_3 basis is also diagonal in the X_1, X_2, X_3 basis. First we will consider when the change of basis satisfies (2.1).

Lemma 5.6. *Let V_1, V_2, V_3 be a basis of the Lie algebra of $SL(2)$ which satisfies (2.1) for $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 2$ and $\lambda_3 = -2$. If X_1, X_2, X_3 is another basis that satisfies (2.1) then the change of basis matrix from V_1, V_2, V_3 to X_1, X_2, X_3 has the form*

$$bda = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\theta) & -\sin(\theta) & 0 \\ \sin(\theta) & \cos(\theta) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cosh(\phi) & -\sinh(\phi) \\ 0 & -\sinh(\phi) & \cosh(\phi) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a_{12} & a_{13} \\ \pm 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mp a_{13} & \mp a_{12} \end{pmatrix} \tag{5.4}$$

for some real parameters θ, ϕ, a_{12} and a_{13} such that $a_{12}^2 - a_{13}^2 = 1$.

Proof. Suppose that we have a basis V_1, V_2, V_3 that satisfies (2.1). Suppose also that the basis $X_i = \sum_{j=1}^{3} A_{ji} V_j$ satisfies (2.1).

Changes of basis given by the matrices b^{-1} and d^{-1} preserve the Lie bracket relations (2.1) for any θ and ϕ. Therefore, it is clear that the change of basis corresponding to A preserves (2.1) if and only if the change $d^{-1}b^{-1}A$ also preserves (2.1). Choosing θ and ϕ appropriately simplifies $d^{-1}b^{-1}A$, and it is then straightforward to find the form that $d^{-1}b^{-1}A$ must take. □

Suppose that T is diagonal in a basis V_1, V_2, V_3. We know from Lemma 5.6 that any change of basis matrix which preserves the Lie bracket relations has the form bda, where b, d and a are given by (5.4).

To apply Lemma 3.2, we need to find out when T remains diagonal under such a change, and how our metric solutions behave under such a change. The following lemma provides initial constraints on T and our change of basis.

Lemma 5.7. *Suppose a left-invariant $(0,2)$ tensor field T is diagonal in a basis V_1, V_2, V_3. Let Y_1, Y_2, Y_3 be the basis related to the basis V_1, V_2, V_3 by the matrix bd and let X_1, X_2, X_3 be the basis related to Y_1, Y_2, Y_3 by the matrix a. If T is diagonal in the basis X_1, X_2, X_3 then T is diagonal in the basis Y_1, Y_2, Y_3 and at least one of the following conditions holds:*

(i) $T_1 = T_2$, where T_i is given by (3.1)

(ii) $\cos(\theta) = 0$

(iii) $\sin(\theta) = 0$.

The proof of Lemma 5.7 is through elementary algebraic manipulation.

Let us now suppose that $T_1 \neq T_2$. This case is treated by Lemmas 5.8 and 5.9. For Lemma 5.8 we suppose that none of T_1, T_2, T_3 is 0 and in Lemma 5.9 we suppose that at least one of T_1, T_2, T_3 is 0. The proof of both lemmas is by direct evaluation and the solving of simple simultaneous equations.

Lemma 5.8. *Suppose there is some left-invariant T such that $Ric(g) = cT$ for some left-invariant g and some constant $c > 0$. Let V_1, V_2, V_3 be a basis satisfying (2.1) in which g and T are diagonal. Suppose that $T_1 \neq T_2$ and none of T_1, T_2, T_3 is 0, where T_i is given by (3.1). If T is diagonal in some other basis X_1, X_2, X_3 which preserves the Lie bracket relations (2.1), then $X_i = \pm V_i$ after possibly interchanging V_1 and V_2.*

Lemma 5.9. *Suppose there is some left-invariant T such that $Ric(g) = cT$ for some left-invariant g and some constant $c > 0$. Let V_1, V_2, V_3 be a basis satisfying* (2.1) *in which g and T are diagonal. Suppose that $T_1 \neq T_2$ and none of T_1, T_2, T_3 is* 0*, where T_i is given by* (3.1)*. If T is diagonal in some other basis X_1, X_2, X_3 which preserves the Lie bracket relations* (2.1)*, then the representation of T is the same, apart from possibly interchanging T_1 and T_2.*

With Lemma 5.8, it is straightforward to verify that if $Ric(g) = cT$ for some T such that $T_1 \neq T_2$ and none of T_1, T_2, T_3 is 0, then the hypothesis of Lemma 3.2 holds because any allowable change of basis is trivial. Therefore the pair (g, c) solving $Ric(g) = cT$ is unique. If one of T_1, T_2, T_3 is 0, there are infinitely many solutions, but Lemma 5.9 shows that the c value is the same for all solutions.

We have completed our assessment of the cases where $T_1 \neq T_2$ so we will now consider the cases where $T_1 = T_2$. In these instances, the change of basis corresponding to the b matrix leaves the representation of T the same as it was before. Then Lemma 5.7 implies that

$$T(Y_2, Y_3) = -\cosh(\phi)\sinh(\phi)T_2 - \cosh(\phi)\sinh(\phi)T_3 = 0,$$

so we must have $T_2 + T_3 = T_1 + T_3 = 0$ or $\sinh(\phi) = 0$.

If $T_2 + T_3 = T_1 + T_3 = 0$ then we have established that the solutions of (3.2) are those which satisfy $v_3 = v_1 + v_2$ and $c = \frac{8}{T_3}$, so the solutions are non-unique and Lemma 3.2 implies that the solutions (g, c) of $Ric(g) = cT$ are non-unique. However, direct computation reveals that in any allowable change of basis, the value of T_3 remains unchanged, so c is the same for all solutions.

Our final case is that $T_1 = T_2$, but $T_2 + T_3 \neq 0$, so $\sinh(\phi) = 0$.

Lemma 5.10. *Suppose T is diagonal in a basis V_1, V_2, V_3 such that $T_1 = T_2$ and $T_2 + T_3 \neq 0$ where T_i is given in* (3.1)*. If T is diagonal in any other basis X_1, X_2, X_3 which preserves the Lie bracket relations, then any metric which is diagonal in the V_1, V_2, V_3 basis with components solving* (3.3) *is also diagonal in the basis X_1, X_2, X_3.*

Proof. Lemma 5.7 implies that $\sinh(\phi) = 0$ so $\phi = 0$ and the d matrix is the identity. In this case, computation reveals that T is diagonal after the bd change and has the same components. Now we know that T is diagonal in the X_1, X_2, X_3 basis, but since X_1, X_2, X_3 is related to Y_1, Y_2, Y_3 by the a matrix and the representation of T in the Y_1, Y_2, Y_3 is still T_1, T_2, T_3, we find that $T(X_2, X_3) = a_{12}a_{13}(T_2 + T_3) = 0$. Therefore, one of a_{12} or a_{13} is 0.

Since $T_1 = T_2$, the equations of (3.2) reveal to us that $\frac{x_1}{v_1} = \frac{x_2}{v_2}$ or $x_3 = 0$, from which we conclude that $v_1 = v_2$ or $v_3 = v_1 + v_2$. We can exclude the second case since $T_2 + T_3 \neq 0$, so we can now assume that $v_1 = v_2$. Due to this constraint, the diagonal metric remains diagonal after the matrix b change. It trivially remains diagonal after the d change and the a change since $\phi = 0$ and one of a_{12} or a_{13} is 0. □

If $T_1 = T_2$ and $T_2 + T_3 \neq 0$, in order to have a solution of (3.3), the numbers T_1, T_2, T_3 must satisfy the conditions of Lemma 5.3 so the solution of (3.3) is unique. The previous proof establishes that $\phi = 0$ and one of a_{12} or a_{13} equals 0. Due to the constraint $1 = a_{12}^2 - a_{13}^2$, we conclude that $a_{13} = 0$. Therefore, our change of basis is simply an interchanging of the vectors V_1, V_2, so the representation of T in the new basis is exactly the same as the old. Therefore the new components of T still satisfy the hypothesis of Lemma 5.3 so the solution of (3.3) is again unique and Lemma 3.2 implies that the pair (g, c) solving $Ric(g) = cT$ is unique.

This concludes our analysis on $SL(2)$.

6 The Remaining Four Three-Dimensional Unimodular Lie Groups

The remaining four three-dimensional unimodular Lie groups are the Euclidean group $E(2)$, the Minkowski group $E(1,1)$, the Heisenberg group H_3, and the group $\mathbb{R}^3$.

The following theorems are the main results for the first three of these Lie groups.

Theorem 6.1. *Let T be a left-invariant $(0,2)$ tensor field on $E(2)$. There exists a left-invariant Riemannian metric g and a positive constant $c > 0$ such that $Ric(g) = cT$ if and only if T is diagonalisable with $T = diag(T_1, T_2, T_3)$ in a basis satisfying (2.1) with $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 2$, $\lambda_3 = 0$ and one of the following conditions is satisfied:*

(i) $T_1 = T_2 = T_3 = 0$

(ii) $T_1 + T_2 > 0$, $T_3 < 0$, $T_1 T_2 < 0$.

In case (i), there are infinitely many solutions (g, c) of $Ric(g) = cT$. In case (ii), the solution (g, c) is unique.

Theorem 6.2. *Let T be a left-invariant $(0,2)$ tensor field on $E(1,1)$. There exists a left-invariant Riemannian metric g and a positive constant $c > 0$ such that $Ric(g) = cT$ if and only if T is diagonalisable with $T = diag(T_1, T_2, T_3)$ in a basis satisfying (2.1) with $\lambda_1 = 2$, $\lambda_2 = -2$, $\lambda_3 = 0$ and one of the following conditions is satisfied:*

(i) $T_1 = T_2 = 0$, $T_3 < 0$

(ii) $T_1 + T_2 > 0$, $T_3 < 0$, $T_1 T_2 < 0$.

In case (i), there are infinitely many pairs (g, c) solving $Ric(g) = cT$, but the c value of all solutions is the same. In case (ii), the pair (g, c) is unique.

Theorem 6.3. *Let T be a left-invariant $(0,2)$ tensor on H_3. There exists a left-invariant Riemannian metric g and a positive constant $c > 0$ such that $Ric(g) = cT$ if and only if T is diagonalisable with $T = diag(T_1, T_2, T_3)$ in a basis satisfying (2.1) with $\lambda_1 = 2$, $\lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = 0$ and $T_1 > 0$, $T_2 < 0$ and $T_3 < 0$. The pair (g, c) is unique.*

As we have done previously, to prove the existence components of these theorems we fix a basis V_1, V_2, V_3 satisfying (2.1) and solve (3.2) with T_i given by (3.1). Since $\lambda_3 = 0$ for each Lie group, this task is simple and the results are presented in the following lemmas.

Lemma 6.4. *Suppose $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 2$ and $\lambda_3 = 0$. Then (3.2) has a solution satisfying $v_1, v_2, v_3 > 0$ if and only if:*

(i) $T_1 = T_2 = T_3 = 0$ or

(ii) $T_3 < 0$, $T_1 + T_2 > 0$ and $T_1 T_2 < 0$.

The solution of (3.2) is non-unique in (i) and is unique in (ii).

Lemma 6.5. *Suppose $\lambda_1 = 2$, $\lambda_2 = -2$ and $\lambda_3 = 0$. Then (3.2) has a solution satisfying $v_1, v_2, v_3 > 0$ if and only if:*

(i) $T_1 = T_2 = 0$ and $T_3 < 0$ or

(ii) $T_3 < 0$, $T_1 + T_2 > 0$ and $T_1 T_2 < 0$. The solution of (3.2) is non-unique in (i) but $c = -\frac{8}{T_3}$ for all solutions. The solution is unique in (ii).

Lemma 6.6. *Suppose $\lambda_1 = 2$, and $\lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = 0$. Then (3.2) has a solution satisfying $v_1, v_2, v_3 > 0$ if and only if $T_1 > 0$, $T_2 < 0$ and $T_3 < 0$. The solution of (3.2) is unique.*

We will now examine the uniqueness component of Theorems 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3. To do this, we will use Lemma 3.2, which means we need to find all other bases in which T is diagonal and (2.1) is satisfied, then examine whether our g solution of $Ric(g) = cT$ remains diagonal after these changes. The following lemmas find the allowable changes of basis. The proofs are similar in style to the proof of Lemma 5.6, but are simplified by the fact that in all cases, we have $\lambda_3 = 0$.

Lemma 6.7. *Let $\lambda_1 = 2$, $\lambda_2 = -2$, $\lambda_3 = 0$ and let $X_i = \sum_{j=1}^{3} a_{ji} V_j$ be a change of basis from a basis V_1, V_2, V_3 which satisfies (2.1). If this new basis satisfies the relations (2.1) then $a_{31} = a_{32} = 0$, $a_{33} = \pm 1$, $a_{21} = \mp a_{12}$ and $a_{11} = \pm a_{22}$.*

Lemma 6.8. *Let $\lambda_1 = 2$, $\lambda_2 = -2$, $\lambda_3 = 0$ and let $X_i = \sum_{j=1}^{3} a_{ji} V_j$ be a change of basis from a basis V_1, V_2, V_3 which satisfies (2.1). If this new basis satisfies the relations (2.1) then $a_{31} = a_{32} = 0$, $a_{33} = \pm 1$, $a_{21} = \pm a_{12}$ and $a_{11} = \pm a_{22}$.*

Lemma 6.9. *Let $\lambda_1 = 2$, $\lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = 0$, and let $X_i = \sum_{j=1}^{3} a_{ji} V_j$ be a change of basis from a basis V_1, V_2, V_3 which satisfies (2.1). If this new basis satisfies the relations (2.1) then $a_{21} = a_{31} = 0$ and $a_{11} = a_{22} a_{33} - a_{23} a_{32}$.*

Now we know when the Lie bracket relations of (2.1) are preserved for each Lie group. It follows from elementary computation that the hypothesis of Lemma 3.2 holds for any of these Lie groups if none of T_1, T_2, T_3 is 0. Similarly, it follows that if T satisfies (i) of Lemma 6.5, then there are infinitely many solutions of $Ric(g) = cT$, but c is the same for all solutions because T_3 is unchanged by changes of basis preserving (2.1) in which T remains diagonal.

For the last of the four Lie groups, $\mathbb{R}^3$ we have $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = 0$. The Ricci curvature of any left-invariant metric on $\mathbb{R}^3$ is 0. Therefore, any pair (g, c) solves $Ric(g) = cT$ if $T = 0$, and there is no solution if $T \neq 0$.

This concludes our analysis of the solvability of the prescribed Ricci curvature problem for left-invariant metrics on the six three-dimensional unimodular Lie groups.

Acknowledgements

This work is based on my Honours thesis at the University of Queensland. I would like to thank my supervisor, Artem Pulemotov, for proposing the problem to me, and for his suggestions and criticism. I would also like to thank Jørgen Rasmussen for the helpful discussions. This research was partially supported by the Australian Research Council through Artem Pulemotov's Discovery Early Career Researcher Award DE150101548.

References

[1] A. Besse. Einstein Manifolds. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987.

[2] E. Delay. Studies of some curvature operators in a neighborhood of an asymptotically hyperbolic Einstein manifold. Adv. Math., 168:213–224, 2002.

[3] E. Delay and M. Herzlich. Ricci curvature in the neighborhood of rank-one symmetric spaces. J. Geom. Anal., 11(4):573–588, 2001.

[4] D. DeTurck. Existence of metrics with prescribed Ricci curvature: local theory. Invent. Math., 65:179–207, 1981/82.

[5] D. DeTurck. Metrics with prescribed Ricci curvature in: S.-T. Yau (ed.), Seminar on differential geometry. pages 525–537, 1982.

[6] D. DeTurck. Prescribing positive Ricci curvature on compact manifolds. Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Politec. Torino, 43:357–369, 1985.

[7] D. DeTurck and H. Goldschmidt. Metrics with prescribed Ricci curvature of constant rank. I. the integrable case. Adv. Math, 145:1–97, 1999.

[8] D. DeTurck and N. Koiso. Uniqueness and non-existence of metrics with prescribed Ricci curvature. Ann. Inst. H. Poincare Anal. Non Lineaire, 1:351–359, 1984.

[9] K. Ha and J. Lee. Left invariant metrics and curvatures on simply connected three-dimensional Lie groups. Math. Nachr., 282:868–898, 2009.

[10] R. Hamilton. The Ricci curvature equation in: S.-S. Chern (ed.), Seminar on nonlinear partial differential equations. pages 47–72, 1984.

[11] O. Kowalski and S. Nikcevic. On Ricci eigenvalues of locally homogeneous Riemannian 3-manifolds. Geom. Dedicata, 62:65–72, 1996.

[12] A. Kremlev and Y. Nikonorov. The signature of the Ricci curvature of left-invariant Riemannian metrics on four-dimensional Lie groups. The unimodular case. Siberian Adv. Math., 19(4):245–267, 2008.

[13] J. Milnor. Curvatures of left invariant metrics on Lie groups. Adv. Math., 21:293–329, 1976.

[14] R. Pina, L. Adriano, and M. Pieterzack. Prescribed diagonal Ricci tensor in locally conformally flat manifolds. J. Math. Anal. Appl., 421:893–904, 2015.

[15] R. Pina and K. Tenenblat. On solutions of the Ricci curvature equation and the Einstein equation. Israel J. Math., 171:61–76, 2009.

[16] A. Pulemotov. Metrics with prescribed Ricci curvature near the boundary of a manifold. Math. Ann., 357:969–986, 2013.

[17] A. Pulemotov. Metrics with prescribed Ricci curvature on homogeneous spaces. J. Geom. Phys., 106:275–283, 2016.

[18] A. Pulemotov. The Dirichlet problem for the prescribed Ricci curvature equation on cohomogeneity one manifolds. Ann. Math. Pura Appl., 2016, to appear.

[19] A. Pulemotov and Y. Rubinstein. Ricci iteration on homogeneous spaces. in preparation.

[20] G. Smith. The Bianchi identity and the prescribed Ricci curvature equation. PhD thesis, The University of Queensland, 2016.